REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 31-34 and 39-43 remain in the application. Claims 1-30 have been canceled and were allowed in the parent application. Claims 35-38 were previously cancelled. Claim 31 has been amended to put the claim into a different form.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) as failing to show every feature of the claimed invention. In particular, the Office Action states that the "control logic and method of assigning priority to a first thread based on the determination that instruction fetch operations for it will be blocked due to processing of instructions for a second thread" is not shown in the drawings. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this objection. "Control logic" as called for in the claim is found in several locations in the drawings (e.g., elements 17, 27, 37, and 47 in Fig. 2), and the method of assigning priority by the control logic is shown in Fig. 3 where Iside starvation is set forth in the figure and defined in the specification as a condition when a thread cannot fetch instructions because the other thread(s) has/have effectively blocked it from doing so (see, e.g., pg. 8 of the specification). Accordingly, the feature set forth by the office action is shown in the drawings as filed. Applicants respectfully request that if the Examiner maintains this objection that he suggest an appropriate amendment to the drawings.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 31-34 and 39-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,018,756 to Doing et al. ("Doing").

Claim 31 recites a method where it is determined "whether instruction fetch operations for a first thread will be blocked due to processing of instructions for a second thread." The other independent claim, claim 39, recites control logic to determine "whether instruction fetch operations for the first thread will be blocked due to processing of instructions for the second thread." Accordingly, these and all of the dependent claims pertain to a determination of whether instruction fetch operations will be blocked. These arguments were presented in the previous Amendment.

The current Office Action addresses this argument by stating that Doing "teaches in the portion cited by the applicant, col. 19, lines 37-49, that T0 keeps on processing, thus blocking the processing of T1, to a certain point, at which point T1 is given a higher priority and switch to T1 occurs (so that excessive number of execution cycle is not wasted). Thus, the cited portion clearly teaches both the blocking (of processing T1 instructions by T0) and assigning (T1) a priority (for switch)."

Though the Office Action contends that the cited section of Doing teaches the blocking of processing instructions and assigning priority, there is nothing in the Office Action that addresses a feature clearly recited in the claims: determining whether instruction fetch operations for one thread will be blocked due to processing of instructions from another thread. Doing is completely silent as to this point. Thus, it cannot be said that Doing anticipates the pending claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 31-34 and 39-43 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 220-4255 to discuss any matter concerning this application. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or §1.17 to Deposit Account **No. 11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 12, 2005

By: _____
Shawn W. O'Dowd
(Reg. No. 34,687)
Attorneys for Intel Corporation

KENYON & KENYON
1500 K Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington DC, 20005

Telephone: (202) 220-4200
Facsimile: (202) 220-4201

DC:582494